

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 28 to 56 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 28 to 35, 38, 40 to 43 and 48 to 55 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 28 to 35, 38, 40 to 43 and 48 to 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,631,813 ("Ikeshita"). It is respectfully submitted that Ikeshita does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

As an initial matter, and while Applicants do not agree with the merits of this rejection, to facilitate matters, claims 28 and 53 have been amended herein without prejudice to recite the feature of a power cable electrically connecting a supply module to a buffer module. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, in the specification at pg. 5, lines 6 to 8 and pg. 7, lines 24 to 25. Claim 48 includes analogous features.

For example, a direct connection of the buffer module with the intermediate circuit may load the network, since large charging currents are generated in the case of an uncharged capacitor. Therefore, the buffer module is not directly connected to the intermediate circuit voltage, but only indirectly connected to it via further devices, such as charging device 10 and the electronic circuit breaker T1 via power cable BRC. See specification at pg. 11, lines 9 to 16.

It is plainly apparent that Ikeshita does not disclose, or even suggest, a power cable electrically connecting a supply module to a buffer module as in the instant claims as presented. Rather, after the initial charging of electrolytic capacitor 7 of Ikeshita is completed, the contacts 8 are closed to allow current to bypass the limiting resistor 6. Col. 2, lines 27 to 28. Furthermore, electrolytic capacitor 7 of Ikeshita is also charged by AC power supply 1 via transistor bridge 12 of regeneration apparatus 54. Col. 2, lines 33 to 39. Thus, it is plainly apparent that Ikeshita fails to disclose all of the features included in independent claims 28, 48 and 53, as well as any dependent claim depending therefrom.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 36, 37 and 44 to 47 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 36, 37 and 44 to 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Ikeshita and U.S. Patent No. 6,367,273 (“Takagi et al.”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ikeshita and Takagi et al. does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 36, 37 and 44 to 47 ultimately depend from claim 28 and therefore include all of the features included in claim 28. As more fully set forth above, Ikeshita does not render unpatentable claim 28. Takagi et al. does not cure the critical deficiencies noted above with respect to claim 28. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ikeshita and Takagi et al. does not render unpatentable claims 36, 37 and 44 to 47, which ultimately depend from claim 28.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Allowed Claims 39 and 56

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that claims 39 and 56 are allowed.

V. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /  /
Clifford A. Ulrich, Reg. No. 42,194

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646

Date: December 1, 2008